

AppIn No. 10/760,222
Amdt. Dated June 6, 2006
Response to Office Action of April 18, 2006

3

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant thanks Examiner for the detailed Office Action dated April 18, 2006. In response to the issues raised, the Applicant offers the following submissions and amendments.

Amendments

The invention is now defined in newly presented claim 5. Previously presented claims 1 and 3 have now been cancelled. Newly presented claim 5 highlights that the pagewidth printhead is incorporate into a user removable cartridge and has only two print chips. These features are shown and described at page 25, lines 6-13 and in Figure 6.

Accordingly, the amendments do not add any new matter.

35 U.S.C. §102 - Claims 1 to 3

Claims 1 to 3 stand rejected for lack of novelty in light of US 6,439,908 to Silverbrook et al. Claims 1 and 3 have been cancelled and the invention recast in newly presented Claim 5.

New claim 5 defines a cartridge that incorporates a pagewidth printhead and ink storage into a single unit that the user can insert and remove from the printer cradle. This ensures that the replacement of printheads is a simple procedure. Claim 5 also defines the bi-lithic structure of the printhead in that it has two separate chips that combine to extend the length of the pagewidth printhead. This simplifies the distribution of power and data to each individual nozzle in both chips by allowing electrical connections at both ends.

In contrast, '908 does not teach a user removable cartridge that has ink storage and a pagewidth printhead as a single unit. Even if the support frame 94 for the printhead assembly 10 (see Fig 3) is considered to be a user removable cartridge, and the reservoir molding 32 is considered to be an ink storage, no two printhead modules 12 have print chips long enough to extend the length of the pagewidth printhead.

Accordingly, '908 fails to disclose all the elements of new claim 5, and therefore dependent claim 2.

Appln No. 10/760,222
Amdt. Dated June 6, 2006
Response to Office Action of April 18, 2006

4

35 U.S.C. §103 - Claim 4

Claim 4 stands rejected as obvious in light of '908 in view of US 6,722,759 to Torgerson et al.

As discussed above, '908 fails to anticipate all the elements of new claim 5. Torgerson also fails to teach a cartridge with a pagewidth printhead having two print chips long enough such that their combined length and at least as long as the pagewidth printhead.

Accordingly, these references do not support a §103 rejection of claim 5. It follows that dependent claim 4 is likewise novel and inventive.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejections have been successfully traversed and the application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:



KIA SILVERBROOK

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762